

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,461,672 to Enokido et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 370,362 to Hansen et al. The Examiner has rejected dependent Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokido et al. in view of Hansen et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,369,788 to Nagai. The Examiner has rejected dependent Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Enokido et al. in view of Hansen et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,450,619 to Maeda.

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 8-15 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the certified translation (Exhibit B) seemed not to fully translate the whole document of the invention disclosure (Exhibit A). Submitted herewith is the certificate of translation setting forth that the translation of the Invention Disclosure is the whole document.

Claims 1-4 have been amended to better clarify the invention.

Enokido discloses a portable radiotelephone, which transmits and receives voice information signals to and from a telephone base station by radio. The radiotelephone includes a telephone main body having a keypad section mounted on its outer surface and containing a microphone unit. A speaker housing containing a speaker unit is slidably mounted on the telephone main body. (See Abstract).

Regarding independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that *Enokido* discloses, “a slide cover, which includes a speaker and is slidable over a front surface of the liquid crystal display in a

longitudinal direction with respect to the main body.” After reviewing *Enokido*, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

More particularly, to support his rejection, the Examiner cites Figure 1 of *Enokido* for allegedly disclosing the above recitation. However, Figure 1 of *Enokido* fails to show a slide cover, which includes a speaker and is slidable over a front surface of the liquid crystal display. This feature is not addressed because Figure 1 and the teaching of *Enokido* are directed to a portable radiotelephone with a display section for displaying the dial numbers and operating modes for transmission and reception, which is mounted on the front side of the main telephone body. (See col. 5, lines 1-4). The present invention is distinguished over the prior art in that the display of *Enokido* is mounted on the front side of the main telephone body along with the speaker. As shown in Figs. 2 and 3 of *Enokido*, the speaker is mounted such that it can never slide over the front surface of the liquid crystal display as recited in Claim 1. Slide grooves 41 and 42 limit the distance traveled by the speaker housing. (See col. 6, line 54-col. 7, line 9). A comparison of Figure 2 of the present invention with Figure 2 of *Enokido* visually shows the difference between the lay out of the present invention with respect to the prior art.

The Examiner acknowledges that *Enokido* fails to disclose a pop-up module connected to the slide cover. The limitation in its entirety recites “a pop-up module connected to the slide cover and inserted into the open front face of the guide holes for sliding the slide cover over the front surface of the liquid crystal display.” The Examiner cites Hansen for curing this deficiency. *Hansen*, however, discloses the rail is substantially placed in parallel with the guide profile. From here the rails will pass through opening in the front cover at the end of the slide tracks in the front cover along a keypad area. (See col. 6, lines 50-55). The front cover is located opposite of the keypad. (See Figure 2). It is physically impossible for the front cover to slide over the front surface of the display as recited by Claim 1. A comparison of Figure 2 of the present invention with Figure 2 of *Hansen* visually shows the difference between the lay out of the present invention with respect to the prior art.

The Examiner has failed to show that all of the recitations of Claim 1 are taught, disclosed or fairly suggested by either *Enokido* or *Hansen et al.*, or the combination thereof. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case for an obviousness rejection.

Examiner has failed to make out a prima facie case for an obviousness rejection.

Claim 1 is not rendered unpatentable by Enokido or Hansen et al., or the combination thereof. Thus, independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-7, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-7.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-15, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**THE FARRELL LAW FIRM, PC**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-3565  
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/EC